UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/583,228	05/26/2000	Pawan Seth	8674-000004	2041

7590 06/30/2003

Harness Dickey & Pierce P L C
P O Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, MI 48303

EXAMINER	
BAHAR, MOJDEH	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
1617	18

DATE MAILED: 06/30/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/583,228	Applicant(s) SETH, PAWAN	
	Examiner Mojdeh Bahar	Art Unit 1617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *14 April 2003* .

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-4,6-14 and 19-24* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-4, 6-14, 19-24* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's amendment and response to the office action of December 12, 2003, submitted April 14, 2003 is acknowledged.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington,* 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-4, 6-14, 19-20 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 7-8 and 12 of U.S. Patent No. 6,117,453. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the patented claims are drawn to a coated extended release composition

comprising 5-45% verapamil (as one of the possible actives), and conventional additives, see claims 1 and 8. US Patent '453 also teaches that its compositions can be coated. Note that '453 teaches all the elements of the coating herein, methacrylate copolymers, hydroxypropylmethyl cellulose, polyethylene glycol and silicon dioxide in its examples.

Although USPN 6,117,453 does not teach the particular pharmaceutical auxiliaries recited herein, the employment of known pharmaceutical excipients and additives are within the skill of the artisan and are therefore obvious.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, 6-14, 19-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morella et al. (USPN 5,378,474).

Morella et al. (USPN 5,378,474) teaches a substantially similar composition as those claimed herein. Morella et al. (USPN 5,378,474) teaches a sustained release pharmaceutical composition having a core element containing an antihypertensive agent such as Verapamil Hydrochloride, a methacrylic polymer (1-30% wt., soluble at a pH from 6-7.5 in the intestines), hydroxypropyl methylcellulose (4-20% wt.), polyethylene glycol (15-35% wt.) and a filler such as silicon dioxide (4-30% wt.), see claims 1, 2, 7 and 9 as well as Col.4, line 24. Morella et al. (USPN 5,378,474) also teaches that the active ingredient in the pharmaceutical composition reaches its maximum concentration between about 4 and about 30 hours, col. 24, claim 1 and

that the bioavailability of the active agents in the pharmaceutical pellet is not compromised by food, col.7, lines 34-40. Morella discloses at least one polymer which is substantially insoluble at acidic pH [i.e., that of the stomach] but at least partially soluble at a less acidic to basic pH [i.e., the pH of the intestine], see col. 6, lines 43-52col. 7 lines 34-62 in particular.

Morella et al. (USPN 5,378,474) does not teach the particular composition containing the specific ingredients in the amounts herein.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the particular composition containing the specific ingredients herein in amounts herein.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make the composition claimed herein since a substantially similar composition is taught in the prior art. Morella et al. (USPN 5,378,474) teaches a similar composition which may contain an antihypertensive agent (including verapamil) and the excipients herein in amounts (wt. percentages) that overlap with those in the instant claims. The optimization of amounts of ingredients to be employed in a composition is considered within the skill of the artisan. The instant composition is not seen to patentably distinguish over the prior art, absent evidence to the contrary. No such evidence is seen.

Response to Arguments

Applicant has amended claim 1, 9 and 11 to recite that the "coating dissolves in the intestines, while withstanding the acidic medium of the stomach and duodenum". Applicant cites page 4, lines 9-11 for supporting this amendment. Note that line 9-11 of page 4 discuss the gastroresistent polymer and not the entire coating. Also note that Morella discloses at least one

polymer which is substantially insoluble at acidic pH [i.e., that of the stomach] but at least partially soluble at a less acidic to basic pH [i.e., the pH of the intestine], see col. 6, lines 43-52col. 7 lines 34-62 in particular. Therefore the Morella reference teaches the newly added limitation.

Applicant also argues that the obviousness double patenting rejection should be withdrawn because the claims of US Patent '453 simply teach the coating of the core tablet. Note that '453 teaches all the elements of the coating herein, methacrylate copolymers, hydroxypropylmethyl cellulose, polyethylene glycol and silicon dioxide in its examples. Further note that the employment of different coatings that are widely known in the art and known pharmaceutical excipients are within the skill of the artisan and are therefore obvious.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mojdeh Bahar whose telephone number is (703) 305-1007. The examiner can normally be reached on (703) 305-1007 Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday from 8:30 a.m. to 6:30 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreeni Padmanabhan, can be reached on (703) 305-1877. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 308-4556.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1235.

Mojdeh Bahar
Patent Examiner
June 23, 2003

SREENI PADMANABHAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER 6/25/03